DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 740 RC 010 089

AUTHOR	Deseran, Forrest A.; Stokley, Gary M.
TITLE	Perceptions of a Tri-Racial Community: Adults vs. Adolescents.
INSTITUTION	Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge. Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Rural Development Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 77
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Annual Meetings (Madison, Wisconsin, September 1977)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adolescents; *Adults; American Indians; Blacks; Caucasians; *Community Attitudes; Community Surveys; Ethnic Groups; Family Status; Heads of Households; Leisure Time; Perception; *Racial Composition; *Rural Population; Secondary School Students; Social Attitudes; *Southern Community
IDENTIFIERS	*Louisiana (South)

ABSTRACT

The study explored the differential levels of satisfaction between adults and adolescents with such dimensions of community life as services, recreation, social environment, family situations, housing, and medical care. Information was also acquired on work status, material possessions, and participation in organizations. Comparisons were made between adults and adolescents in general, parents and their offspring, and the general school population with a student matched sample. During the summer of 1976, interviews were conducted with 216 household heads or their spouses and 192 junior high school and high school students from 2 rural non-farm communities in Southern Louisiana, characterized by their tri-racial composition (Indian, white, Black). Those interviewed were paid $2.00 as compensation for their time and information; interviewers were selected from the communities. Data analysis was concerned with the main effects of age and race on community and family evaluations. T-tests were used to explore the differences in mean scores of the dependent variables. Findings included: adolescent evaluative responses to their community situation were much more positive than adult responses; white respondents were much more optimistic about their past and present family situations and their houses than non-white respondents; and 89% of the adolescents indicated that they had no intentions of moving from their immediate locale. (NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED144740

RECEIVED

Perceptions of a Tri-Racial Community:

Adults vs. Adolescents

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Forrest A. Deseran

Gary M. Stokley

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Forrest A Deseran

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

RC 010089

A paper submitted for the Rural Sociological Society Annual Meetings, Madison, Wisconsin, September, 1977.

Development of this paper was supported by the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to the Louisiana Title V pilot program for LaFourche and Terrebonne Parishes funded by Public Law 92-419 of the Rural Development Act of 1972.

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF A TRI-RACIAL COMMUNITY: ADULTS vs. ADOLESCENTS

Although there has been an increasing interest in community satisfaction, little attention has been paid to one important social component existing in all communities: youth. There are both theoretical and practical reasons for focusing research attention on differential levels of satisfaction between resident youth and adults. Age, as a structural parameter, potentially organizes behavioral interaction patterns and experiential phenomena, which likely leads to differential interpretations of community circumstances. Related to the concept of community, age differentials are related to the perpetuation, maintenance, and/or abandonment of communities. Concern with outmigration of youth, especially from southern rural communities, points to the importance of exploring community satisfaction of younger residents.

The present study explores the differential levels of satisfaction between adults and adolescents with a number of dimensions related to community life: services, recreation, social environment, family situations, etc. Data are from two rural communities in Southern Louisiana, characterized by their tri-racial composition (Indian, White, Black). The sample includes a random sample of high school and junior high school children, random samples of adults from each community, and a matched sample of adults and their adolescent offspring. Comparisons are made between adults and adolescents in general, parents and their offspring, and the general school population with the student matched sample.

INTRODUCTION

Recently there has been a growing interest in the nature and correlates of community satisfaction. This research interest has been largely precipitated by the conviction that objective indicators of quality of life are not adequate in themselves to accurately reflect subjective states of individuals to whom the objective measures supposedly refer. As Berger (1974) warns, outsiders' claims to knowledge of insiders' worlds can be frought with possibilities of significant error. This is particularly relevant for social indicator research which potentially has direct implications for policy decisions.

Related to the problem of subjective realities in community research is the issue of "whose realities?" Warren (1975) suggests that local communities, despite our common-sense knowledge, are on "all-of-a-piece" units. Rather, communities are comprised of a variety of subgroups with oft-times divergent bases for experiencing and interpreting community related phenomena. Thus, the problem of community research is not only to explore the subjective worlds of residents, but to delineate parameters along which cognitive realities might be organized. This is a problem which has not gone unrecognized; indeed aggregating residents along such structural dimensions as age, sex, race, etc. has almost become a habituated reality for researchers. However, a large part of our research tends to aggregate along such lines more for matters of convenience than for theoretical concerns. Our intention is to explore age differentials as a parameter which has theoretical and practical relevance for concerns with community satisfaction. More specifically, we will systematically explore community perceptions of adolescents and adults in two rural communities.

Our focus on adult and adolescent community perceptions is based upon two related theoretical issues. First, age as a structural parameter potentially organizes behavioral interaction patterns. Most notable of the experiential differentials in the present study is the student status of the adolescents. Since our adolescent subjects are enrolled in either junior or high schools, it can be assumed that a good deal of their peer interactions and activities center around school related behaviors. This is not to argue that adolescent aged residents of communities are likely to experience community related phenomena similarly to adults outside the school setting. As is well known, a wide range of behaviors are differentially available due to age (i.e., voting behavior, drinking, driving, etc.). Given these assumptions, it would not be unusual to expect that adults and adolescents would evaluate their communities from differing perspectives and consequently would reflect differing levels of satisfaction with their communities. Several empirical questions remain: (1) to what degree do adults and adolescents differ in their evaluations of community situations? (2) what aspects of community are differentially relevant to adults and adolescents? (3) what are the socialization patterns or experiential phenomena influencing differential perceptions?

Research comparing value and attitude patterns of youth and adults has reported mixed ifndings. While Gottlieb and Ramsye (1964), Coleman (1961), and Smith (1962) argue that significant differences exist between adults and youth on a variety of issues, other researchers have found very little value differentiation between young persons and their adult counterparts (Schwartz and Merten, 1967; Snyder, 1966). Focusing on rural youth and family orientations, Bealer and Willits (1961) and Hough et al (1969) found very little difference.

The majority of the studies dealing with differential attitudes or values have dealt with rather general issues (i.e., attitudes toward race, social aspirations, etc.) There has been very little interest in perceptions of community from an age specific comparative perspective. One exception is research conducted by one of the authors on rural Colorado communities which revealed distinct differences in level of satisfaction between adolescents and adults (Deseran, 1975). It was this reserach which pointed to the second important theoretical issue prompting the present research in Louisiana.

This second theoretical concern involves the general concept of community. On an abstract level, community theories tend to emphasize the perpetuation and maintenance of community over time where community is conceptualized as preceding and persisting beyond individu l members. Central to this notion is the process of socialization whereby younger potential community actors internalize community values and norms as they are passed from one generation to the next. One can assess community from four processual dimensions (1) initiation, (2) maintenance, (3) alteration, and (4) abandonment (Knop, 1975).

The present emphasis on the divergence of adolescent and adult definitions of community situation is especially relevant to the last three mentioned components of theoretical concern. Maintenance of community involves, among other things, the ability of citizens to perpetuate ongoing patterns and relationships. Such a social process requires the socialization and integration of new members into the existing system and as such depends largely upon mutual definitions of community situation. Divergent perceptions, of course, may not necessarily disrupt community but rather be precursory to alteration of community situation. As old members become

less active and influential in the community, new members, with varying viewpoints become major actors (assuming they do not decide to abandon the present community for alternative situations) and through their definitions of community situation transform the community accordingly.

The possibility of abandonment of community is a very practical reason for being concerned with adolescent as well as adult perceptions. Many smaller communities have experienced attrition through outmigration of younger adults intent upon settling in more urban settings (Simon and Gagnon, 1969; Fuguitt, 1971; Beale, 1969,1972,1974.) Although much of the literature dealing with the decline of communities emphasizes economic push or pull factors, it is contended here that it is also important to explore younger citizens' definitions of their present community situation.

METHODOLOGY

The data for this research was gathered during the summer 1976 as a part of a Title V Project in Louisiana. Two communities were sampled for extensive interviewing. The respondents were heads of households or their spouses (N-216) and junior high school and high school students (N=192). The survey focused primarily on satisfaction with the community, community services, leisure time activities, housing, medical care, as well as on acquiring information regarding work status, material possessions, and participation in organizations.

The adult sample was derived by dividing both communities into equal population segments in order to obtain a 50% household sample in the smaller community a 25% sample in the larger community. The student sample was randomly selected from junior and senior high schools in the area. Approximately ten percent of students in these schools were interviewed. Our

analysis for this paper includes all of the adults and only those students living in the communities studied (Student N=90).

Interviewers were selected from the communities in order to overcome a variety of problems both on a general methodological level and relative to the particular setting. As Gorden (1975:85-137) argues, indigenous interviewers can facilitate the communication process and maximize input from respondents. Although there are shortcomings to insider interviews, given the nature of the community setting and the particular types of questions involved, it was decided that such a strategy would be productive. Another reason for the use of indigenous interviewers was that many persons in these communities speak Cajun French, in which each of the interviewers was proficient. Workshops were conducted in order to both train the interviewers in interviewing techniques and to check the adequacy of the interview schedule relative to cultural-linguistic deficiencies. Several of the women selected as interviewers had had prior field experience in the area and provided invaluable suggestions for improving items on the questionnaire.

One further methodological technique should be mentioned. Our approach to the adult citizens of these communities was to treat them as "consultants" as opposed to "respondents" or "subjects." We were able to pay each person interviewed two dollars as compensation for his or her time and information. Reactions from those whom were interviewed indicated that such an approach had a great deal of appeal and we concluded that the very low turn-down rate may be at least partially attributed to such an approach.

The target communities are multi-racial communities in a rural non-farm area of Louisiana. The physical appearance of the communities vary little in comparison with other fishing oriented communities along the coast. The general settlement pattern of the communities is quite varied. Whites,

Blacks, and Indians live together in various parts of the settlement in a long line of homes stretching north to south for about eight miles on both sides of two bayous, although there is a tendency for each group to cluster in certain areas of the community. Most of the blacks live in the extreme northern part of one community in a settlement with its own name. The community with most of the business establishments and services is predominately white but with a substantial Indian and Black population. The majority of the Indians in this area are the largest of eight subcommunities of the Houma Tribe which is the largest tribe in Louisiana today.

VARIABLES

Dependent Variable: Community Evaluation. The interview schedule included twenty items related to specific aspects of local community, ranging from services to interpersonal qualities. These items were selected from various earlier community satisfaction research efforts (Deseran, 1975; Steelman and Deseran, 1976; Marans and Rodgers, 1975). Residents rated the items on a five-point scale from very good to very poor. Responses were then subjected to principal component factor analysis and verimax rotation in order to delineate dimensions of community evaluation scales. Without an extended discussion of the problems associated with such techniques (see Knop and Stewart, 1973), two factor patterns emerged which provided items (loading at .5000 or higher) for composite indexes of community evaluation to be used in this study. As

can be seen in Table 1, the first set of items are all services oriented and are labeled "services". The second set of items is not as easily categorized, but we labeled them as "community environment" because the three items encompass both the social environment (agreement on community issues) and the physical environment which is closely related to recreation with the communities discussed (hunting and fishing are major pass times in the area). Factor loadings were used to weight item scores in the calculation of mean index scores for each respondent.

Family Situation. Evaluations of the respondents' family situation have been included in this study as a possible intervening factor in subject's evaluations of community circumstances. Because of our interest in the differential perceptions of adults and adolescents, the family situation would appear to be central to both groups. This variable was operationalized by respondents' answers to questions concerning their estimation of their families' position on a 10 point scale (ladder) where 10 equals the "best possible life for your family" and 1 represents the "worst possible life for your family." We asked respondents to answer this question for the present, 5 years ago, and five years in the future.

House Satisfaction. Respondents were asked to evaluate their dwelling on a five point scale (1= very satisfied to 5= very dissatisfied). As with family situation, it was felt that one's satisfaction with his or her dwelling might be an important interviewing factor (Marans and Rodgers, 1975). Also, house situation is an aspect of one's life space which is

common across age groups, thereby providing an additional source of information regarding divergent evaluations jointly experience aspects of community living.

Independent Variables: Age and Race Although there are a variety of potentially important variables associated with evaluations of community and family situations, our present focus is upon age and race. Age, as mentioned, has been dichotomized into adult and adolescent categories (Adult mean age= 39.84; adolescent mean age = 13.86). Race, although comprised of three identifiable groups (white, Indian, and Black) has been dichotomized as white and non-white in order to maintain sufficient cell frequencies. Also, there is justification for combining these two groups since they are both considered to be "minority" groups in the communities. (Stanton, 1971; Roy, 1959, Fischer, 1968)

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The analysis of the data presented in this paper is concerned only with the main effects of age and race on community and family evaluations. As such, we emphasize the preliminary nature of our findings and realize that further analysis is required for a more complete assessement of the data. T-Tests have been used to explore the differences in mean scores of the dependent variables.

The major effect of age groups on community evaluation scales is immediately evident (Table 2). Adolescent scores are consistently and

significantly higher than adult scores for both community services and community environment. Controlling for race reveals that, while both non-white and white respondents diverge along age lines, the non-white subjects tend to be more perceptually separated than the white subjects.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The differences between age groups for each of the items on the initial community evaluation scale (Tables 3a and 3b) further substantiates the findings noted on Table 2. While only four of the 20 items do not yield statistically significant differences in mean scores for the non-white subjects, 10 of the items are not differentiated significantly between adults and adoloscents for the white respondents. This indicates that the non-white community members contributed more to the noted overall community perceptual differences than the white members. However, it is apparent that there is more convergence than divergence between races in terms of community evaluative patterns of adults and adolescents. And it is also evident that the adolescents are much more positive in their evaluative responses to their community situation than adults. (Although not reported here, our anlysis reveals no significant differences between races on community evaluation items).

TABLES 3a AND 3b ABOUT HERE

Turning attention to evaluation of family situation and dwelling (Table 4), it is interesting to note that there is very little differentiation between group mean scores. The only statistically significant result is for the total sample on subject estimations of family situation five years in the future ($T=2.0260$, $p< .05$). None of the tests for differences between age groups show significant variations within the racial categories.

TABLES 4 AND 5 ABOUT HERE

Inspection of the mean scores in Table 4 indicate that although there are no major differences between age groups for family and house evaluations, there are differences across racial groupings. The results of tests of differences between white and non-white scores for these items (Table 5) reveals that the white subjects tended to be much more optimistic about their past and present family situations and their houses than the non-white subjects. This difference is most marked for the adults in the sample regarding family situations and for the adolescents regarding house evaluation.

DISCUSSION

The major conclusion which can be drawn from this initial analysis is that adults and adolescents do not necessarily evaluate aspects of their communities similarly. Furthermore, at least for the communities studied, adolescent evaluative responses are much more positive than adult responses. This noted difference is more extreme for non-white

residents than white residents. These noted divergencies only apply to those community aspects which are removed from the immediate living experiences of residents and apparently do not occur for at least two aspects explored here (family situation and dwelling satisfaction). These findings raise some interesting questions.

The observation of differences in community perceptions across age-groups is not puzzling in itself. Aspects of community (schools, physical environment, jobs, etc.) impinge upon residents differentially. For example, an adolescent's experiences with job opportunities or medical or health care facilities are undoubtedly qualitatively different than an adult's experiences. In essence, dimensions of community "reality" are differentially experienced along the age structural parameter. The meaning of job opportunities, for example, may be much different for the adolescent in high school who is being taught that mobility is a "natural phenomena" than for the person who has been working and first-handedly knows that mobility is dependent upon a variety of educational and opportunity factors.

Another possible factor can be argued in terms of differential associational patterns. The contextual experience of being in school and associating with adolescent peers likely evokes different world view constructions than occur in occupational or neighborhood friendship settings of adults. Thus, it may be that the adolescent's "social stock of knowledge" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966) is qualitatively different from an adult's, at least relative to community factors, through alternative socializing sources (Curtis, 1974).

In line with this reasoning, the noted differences between racial groups (in terms of perceptions of family situation and housing situation) suggest that phenomena experienced jointly across age groups (i.e., house, family), may differ for each racial group. This difference may be a reflection of general cultural differences in evaluating life circumstances, or a reflection of some objective differences in evaluating life circumstances, or a reflection of some objective differences in evaluating life circumstances. Because the racial differences noted between the community evaluation items are negligible, we cannot assume that all evaluative responses are culturally biased, therefore it seems likely that the evaluative responses to family and house are reflections of objective factors. In this particular research site, for example, it was found (and reported elsewhere) that objective indicators of housing quality were significantly lower for the non-white subjects (Stokley and Deseran, 1977).

These findings, although suggestive that community realities are differentiated along age and racial parameters, are far from conclusive. It remains to be discovered why the adolescent subpopulation tends to view their community situation much more postively than do the adults. Similar research in Colorado rural communities (Deseran, 1975) revealed a wide divergence between adults and adolescents, but in the opposite direction. There, adolescents were generally very negative regarding their communities while adults were very positive. Such divergence in findings may be a reflection of the particular circumstances of the communities themselves or due to distinct cultural differences. One major cultural difference noticed by the authors is that family ties in the Louisiana communities were very close,

especially for the Indian subpopulation. While many of the Colorado adolescents were anxious to move out of their communities (for a variety of reasons), very few of the Louisiana adolescents indicated any desire to move to other areas (89% of the Louisiana adolescents indicated that they had no intentions of moving from their immediate locale).

Despite the need to further explore and assess the data on hand, it is fairly evident that the determination of community evaluative responses of residents is not easily captured by unitary measures. Warren's suggestion that communities are not "one-of-piece" units (Warren, 1975) is well illustrated by this research. Age, as a major structural parameter (Blau, 1974), corresponds to major differentials in perceptions of community. Assumptions that youth reflect the values and beliefs of their elders in rural settings (Chand et al, 1975), while perhaps valid for some aspects of life experiences, should not be generalized to all areas. Rural life, although seemingly homogenous when compared to the complexities of urban settings, evidently is not cognitively constant across age groups. It is the task of the sociologi to recognize potential subgroups within community settings whose realities may differ significantly from the representative residents, what Berger (1974) labels "cognitive minorities". This is especially important when the data gathered by sociologists have implications for policy decisions which impinge upon real lives. Without attempting to step too far beyond the confines of a limited study, it seems safe to say that we must not make assumptions about people's beliefs and perceptions without some notion of relevant structural dimensions along which realities may be experience and constructed.

REFERENCES

Beale, Calvin
1969 "Natural Decrease of Population: the Current and Prospective Status of an Emergent American Phenomenon." Demography 6:91-99.

Beale, Calvin
1972 "Rural and Nonmetropolitan Population Trends of Significance to National Population Growth and the American Future." Research Reports, Vol-5.

Beale, Calvin
1974 "Rural Development: Population and Settlement Prospects." Soil and Water Conservation 29: 23-27.

Bealer, Robert and Fern K. Willits
1961 "Rural Youth: A Case Study in the Rebelliousness of Adolescents." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 338 (November): 63-69.

Berger, Peter
1974 Pyramids of Sacrifice: Political Ethics of Social Change. N.Y.: Basic Books Inc.

Berger, Peter and Thomas Luckmann
1966 The Social Construction of Reality, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company.

Chand, I. P., D. M. Crider, and F. K. Willits
1975 "Parent-Youth Disagreement as Perceived by Youth: A Longitudinal Study." Youth and Society 6 (March) 365-375.

Coleman, James J.
1961 The Adolescent Society New York: Free Press.

Curtis, Russell L.
1974 "Parents and Peers: Serendipity in a Study of Shifting Reference Sources." Social Forces 52 (March) 368-375.

Deseran, Forrest A.
1975 "Definitions of Community: A Compartive Study." Unpublished Dissertation, Colorado State University.

Fischer, Ann
1968 "History and Current Status of the Houma Indians" in S. Levine and N. Lurie (eds). The American Indian Today. Florida: Everett/Edwards.

Fuguitt, Glenn
1971 "The Places Left Behind: Population Trends and Policy for Rural America." Rural Sociology 36: 49-70.

Gorden, Raymond L.
1975 Interviewing Strategy, Techniques and Tactics (rev.ed.) Homewood Ill: The Dorsey Press.

Gottlieb, David and Charles Ramsey
1964 The American Adolescent. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

Hough, Richard L., Gene F. Summers and James O'Meara
1969 "Parental Influence, Youth Contraculture, and Rural Adolescent Youth Attitudes Toward Minority Groups." Rural Sociology Vol. 34, No. 3, (Sept): 383-386.

Knop, Edward E.
1976 "Theoretical Perspectives on Community Process and Form." The Social Science Journal 13: 103-118.

Knop, Edward and Ken Stewart
1973 "Community Satisfaction: Conceptual and Methodological Problems." Paper presented at the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association Meetings, Laramie, Wyoming.

Marans, Robert and Willard Rodgers
1975 "Toward an Understanding of Community Satisfaction." In Howley, A. and U.P. Rock (eds). Metropolitan America in Contemporary Perspective. N.Y.: John Wiley.

Roy, Edison P.
1959 "The Indians of Dulac: A Descriptive Study of a Racial Hybrid Community in Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana." Unpublished Dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Schwartz, Gary and Don Merten
1967 "The Language of Adolescence: An Anthropological Approach to the Youth Culture." American Journal of Sociology 72 (March): 453-468.

Simon, William and John H. Gagon
1969 "The Decline and Fall of the Small Town." in R. M. French (ed), The Community. Illinois: Peacock Publishers, Inc., Pp. 497-510.

Smith, Ernest
1962 American Youth Culture, New York: Free Press.

Snyder, Eldon E.
1966 "Socioeconomic Variations, Values and Social Participation Among High School Students." Journal of Marriage and the Family 28 (May): 174-176.

Stanton, Max E.
1971 "The Indians in the Grand Caillou-Dulac Community." Unpublished Thesis, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Steelman and Deseran
1976 "A Multivariate Analysis of Factors Related to Definitions of County Situations by Rural Residents." Paper presented at the Southwest Sociological Association Meetings, Dallas, Texas.

Stokley, Gary and F. A. Deseran
1977 "Definitions of Housing Situations: Outsiders vs Insiders in Rural Communities" Paper submitted for the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, Atlanta, Georgia.

Warren, Roland
1975 "External Forces Affecting Local Communities - Bad News and Good News" Journal of Community Development Society 6: 5-13.

Community Items Selected for Community Evaluation Indexes
Table 1.

Factor 1 (Services)			Factor 2 (Community Environment)		
	Item	Loading		Item	Loading
1.	Oppor. for Higher Ed.	.8800	1.	Recreation	.5456
2.	Med. Health Care	.7160	2.	Physical Environ.	.7639
3.	Job Opportunities	.6259	3.	Agreement on Community Issues	.5888
4.	Public Utilities	.5347			
5.	Housing Provisions	.8204			
6.	Shopping Facilities	.5805			

Table 2. Results of T-Tests for Differences in Community Evaluation Scale Scores Between Adults and Adolescents by Race

	White					Non-White					Total				
	Adults		Adolesc.			Adults		Adolesc.			Adults		Adolesc.		
	N	$\bar{x}$	N	$\bar{x}$	T Score	N	$\bar{x}$	N	$\bar{x}$	T Score	N	$\bar{x}$	N	$\bar{x}$	T Score
Community Services Scale Score	82	1.49	43	1.83	-4.82 ****	131	1.40	47	1.83	-9.22 ****	213	1.43	90	1.83	-10.70 ****
Community Environment Scale Scores	82	1.25	43	1.41	-2.82 **	131	1.26	47	1.44	-4.09 ****	213	1.26	90	1.43	- 4.96 ****

* $P \leq .05$
** $P \leq .01$
*** $P \leq .001$
**** $P \leq .0001$

Table 3a Results for T-Tests of Differences Between Mean Community Item Scores of Adults and Adolescents by Race

COMMUNITY ITEMS	WHITE							NONWHITE						
	ADULTS			ADOLESCENTS			T SCORE	ADULTS			ADOLESCENTS			T SCORE
	N	SD	$\bar{X}$	N	SD	$\bar{X}$		N	SD	$\bar{X}$	N	SD	$\bar{X}$	
Parish Government	68	1.09	3.00	42	.67	3.48	-2.83**	75	.92	2.96	44	.62	3.57	-4.28****
Public Schools	77	.95	3.38	43	1.08	3.79	-2.38*	120	.80	3.42	46	.66	3.70	-2.05*
Private Schools	21	1.34	3.09	33	1.18	3.55	-1.30	29	.19	2.52	33	.98	3.27	-2.97**
Opp. High Ed.+	77	.98	2.52	43	.67	2.97	-2.94**	109	.81	2.41	45	.82	2.99	-4.06****
Law Enforcement	78	1.19	2.86	43	1.00	3.40	-2.50**	119	.93	2.67	47	.88	3.70	-6.52****
Law Obed. Adults	78	.89	3.28	43	.91	3.14	.46	110	.86	2.97	47	.82	3.13	-1.05
Law Obed. Young	75	.42	1.07	43	.42	1.17	-1.19	106	.32	1.06	47	.38	1.15	-1.47
Road & Trans.	80	.32	.84	42	.28	.89	- .80	130	.28	.81	47	.25	.98	-3.51***
Job Opportunities+	79	.44	1.29	43	.41	1.39	-1.22	126	.38	1.19	47	.35	1.37	-2.81**
Real Income	79	.61	1.67	43	.48	1.66	.09	128	.56	1.51	46	.43	1.80	-3.56***
Churches	76	.74	3.82	43	.74	3.97	-1.14	124	.70	3.73	47	.60	3.77	- .34
Recreation++	79	.35	.99	43	..28	1.11	-2.05*	126	.30	.95	47	.26	1.17	-4.59****
Public Utilities+	82	.29	.96	43	.26	1.10	-2.55**	131	.23	.96	47	.21	1.11	-3.83***
Phys. Environ.++	76	.61	1.77	41	.47	1.96	-1.81	128	.54	1.65	45	.50	1.98	-3.57***
Housing+	60	.77	1.83	38	.58	2.32	-3.36***	92	.63	1.70	43	.60	2.24	-4.69****
Commty. Pride	73	1.2	3.08	42	.92	3.79	-3.45***	127	.88	3.28	47	.88	3.57	-1.94
Friendliness	81	.88	3.85	43	.84	4.09	-1.47	128	.87	3.53	47	.97	3.97	-2.92**
Helpfulness	82	1.02	3.56	43	.98	3.60	- .23	127	.89	3.35	47	.83	3.85	-3.39***
Shop. Facilities+	82	.40	.97	43	.30	1.23	-4.00****	128	.35	.95	47	.21	1.32	-8.45****
Agree. on Cmty. Issues++	61	.36	.88	38	.27	1.18	-4.74****	80	.25	1.06	43	.22	1.19	-2.81**
Medical Care+	80	.71	1.47	42	.54	2.05	-4.68****	125	.56	1.46	46	.35	2.06	-8.39****

+ = Items for Community Services Index

++ = Items for Community Environment Index

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$, **** $p<.0001$.

Table 3b. T-Test Results for Differences Between Adolescents and Adults for Community Evaluation Items

Items	Adults N	Adults SD	Adults $\bar{x}$	Adolescents N	Adolescents SD	Adolescents $\bar{x}$	T Score
Parish Govt.	143	1.00	2.98	86	.65	3.52	-4.99****
Public Schools	197	.86	3.39	89	.89	3.74	-3.16**
Private Schools	50	1.19	2.76	66	1.08	3.41	-3.07**
Opp. High Ed. +	186	.89	2.46	88	.75	2.98	-4.82****
Medical Care +	204	.62	1.46	88	.45	2.06	-9.21****
Law Enforce.	197	1.04	2.75	90	.95	3.56	-6.27****
Law Obed. Adults	188	.88	3.07	90	.86	3.13	- .52
Law Obed. Young	181	.36	1.06	90	.40	1.16	-1.90
Roads & Trans.	210	.30	.82	89	.27	.94	-3.07**
Job Opportunities +	205	.41	1.23	90	.38	1.38	-2.99**
Real Inc.	207	.58	1.57	89	.46	1.73	-2.53**
Churches	200	.72	3.76	90	.67	3.87	-1.19
Recreation ++	205	.32	.97	90	.27	1.14	-4.73****
Pub. Utilities	213	.25	.96	90	.24	1.10	-4.51****
Phy. Environ. ++	204	.57	1.70	86	.48	1.97	-3.96****
Housing +	152	.69	1.75	81	.59	2.28	-5.82****
Comm. Pride	200	1.03	3.21	89	.90	3.67	-3.67***
Friendliness	209	.89	3.66	90	.91	4.03	-3.36***
Helpfulness	209	.94	3.43	90	.90	3.73	-2.61**
Shop. Facilities +	210	.37	.96	90	.26	1.28	-8.42****
Agreement on Comm. Issues ++	141	.31	.98	81	.24	1.18	-5.36****

* $P \leq .05$, ** $P \leq .01$, *** $P \leq .001$, **** $P \leq .0001$.

Table 4. Results of T-Tests for Differences in Perceptions of Adults and Adolescents of Family, Situations Presently, Five Years Ago, Five Years in the Future, and Satisfaction with House by Race

	White					Non-White					Total				
	Adults		Adoles.			Adults		Adoles.			Adults		Adoles.		
	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	T Score	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	T Score	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	T Score
Present Family Situation	80	7.60	43	7.58	.05	127	6.46	45	6.67	-.53	207	6.90	88	7.11	-.7529
Family Situation 5 Years Ago	81	6.23	42	6.48	-.54	123	4.93	44	5.48	-1.22	204	5.45	86	5.97	-1.5361
Family Situation In 5 Years	72	9.15	43	8.49	1.51	121	8.62	44	8.11	1.49	193	8.82	87	8.30	2.0260 *
Satisfaction with with House	82	4.45	42	4.62	-1.2079	133	4.14	47	4.26	-.6983	215	4.26	89	4.43	.1146

* $p \leq .05$
** $p \leq .01$
*** $p \leq .001$

Table 5 Results of T-Tests for Differences in Whites and Non-White Evaluations of Family Situation and House Satisfaction by Age Groups

	ADULTS					ADOLESCENTS					TOTAL				
	Whites		Non-W		T	Whites		Non-W		T	Whites		Non-W		T
	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	Score	N	$\bar{X}$	N		Score	N	$\bar{X}$			Score
Present Family Situation	80	7.60	127	6.46	-3.56***	43	7.58	45	6.67	-2.28*	123	7.59	172	6.52	-4.28****
Past Family Situation	81	6.23	123	4.93	-3.44***	42	6.48	44	5.48	-1.98	123	6.32	167	5.07	-4.08****
Future Family Situation	72	9.15	121	8.62	-1.34	43	8.49	44	8.11	- .99	115	8.90	165	8.45	-1.47
House Satisfaction	82	4.45	133	4.14	-2.18*	42	4.62	47	4.26	-2.35**	124	4.44	180	4.14	-3.10**

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, **** p<.001.